

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/064,322	HUFFMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Theresa T. Snider	1744	

**All Participants:**

(1) Theresa T. Snider.

(2) John McGarry.

**Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 31 March 2005

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**  
 N/A

**Claims discussed:**  
 2-3, 6, 8-13 and 15-23

**Prior art documents discussed:**  
 Jonsson

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**  
 See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner informed Mr. McGarry that Amendment After Final of 3/24/2005 will be entered. Examiner informed Mr. McGarry of allowability of claims 2-3, 6, 8-12 and 15-23. Examiner explained that she overlooked the Jonsson reference when writing the final rejection and that it, in combination with the ASPA, would read on claim 13 (see below). To further prosecution by avoiding a second action non-final, Examiner and Mr. McGarry agreed on claim language, as set forth in the attached Examiner's Amendment, to overcome Jonsson. As amended, claim 13 requires a 1st end of the pivot arm to be pivotally to the housing and the 2nd end attached to the brush with one end of the spring attached to the 1st end and another end attached to the housing. Jonsson, HOWEVER, discloses a 1st end (#52) of the pivot arm(#50b) to be pivotally mounted to the housing(#10) and the 2nd end(#50c) attached to the brush (#24) with one end of the spring (#59) attached to the 2nd end (#50c) and another end attached to the housing (#17). With this amendment, claim 13 is deemed allowable.

#### Proposed Rejection

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted State of the Prior Art as set forth in the preamble of the Jepson Claim (hereafter ASPA) in view of Jonsson.

ASPA discloses a similar surface cleaning apparatus however fails to disclose the elongated agitation brush mounted to the housing through a pair of arms and a spring.

Jonsson discloses a surface cleaning machine with an elongated agitation brush mounted to a housing through a pair of arms wherein a spring is located between the arms and the housing to bias the brush into contact with the surface to be cleaned (fig. 3, #24,50b,51,10,50c,59,17, col. 5, lines 1-2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the brush mounting means of Jonsson in ASPA to allow the brush to move more easily in the vertical direction in response to the pile of surface.